



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,627	03/06/2002	Bas Ording	P2349-506	4921

7590 10/07/2008  
Philip W. Marsh  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER
----------

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/07/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's Amendment filed on 06/23/08 has been entered.

Claims 1, 14, 23, 28, 31 and 34 have been amended. However, the limitations of the amended have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore, claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9-14, 16-25 and 27-36 are rejected under the new ground of rejection as set forth below.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 23 and 27 are objected because the term of "computer readable medium" is not defined in the specification.

#### ***Specification***

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).

Correction of the following is required: the term of "computer readable medium" is not defined in the specification.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2179

Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9-14, 16-25 and 27-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiura et al. [US. 6,628,310] in view of Jobs et al. [US. 6,957,395].

**As to claims 1, 14 and 23**, Hiura et al. teach computer implemented method and corresponding apparatus for providing an aesthetically pleasing transition between a first graphical user interface element associated with a first application running on a computer and a corresponding second GUI element associated with a second application running on the computer (computer system, figure 11), the first application being displayed on a computer display in a first window (the first application on window 211) and the second application in a second window (the second application on window 212) comprising the steps/means a first element associated with a first application running on a computer (figure 11, window 211) and a second GUI element associated with a second application running on the computer (figure 11, window 212), the first application being displayed on a computer display in a first window and the second application in a second window (column 1, line 60 through column 2, line 37).

Hiura et al. teach detecting when the first application is active, user selection the object on the first window to initiate an operation of turning over to which the first window is to be turned over so as to unveil a second window that is laid under the first window, whereby enabling to peed a content of the second window (column 2, lines 1-15); removing from the computer display the first GUI element associated with the first application and replacing the first GUI element

Art Unit: 2179

with the corresponding second GUI element associated with the second application (column 2, lines 30-37); and in response to detecting the user selection of the first window, providing visual notification of the replacement of the first GUI element with the second GUI element by rendering animation graphics to animate a transition between the display of the first and second GUI elements (column 3, lines 36-44 and column 4, lines 37-50).

Although Hiura et al. teach detecting when the first application is active, user selection the object on the first window to initiate an operation of turning over to which the first window is to be turned over so as to unveil a second window that is laid under the first window, whereby enabling to peed a content of the second window, Hiura fails to clearly teach the step of detecting when the first application is active, user selection of the second window to make the second application active. However, Jobs et al. teach the limitation at column 1, line 60 through column 2, line 12. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Jobs with Hiura's system. Motivation of the combination would have been to obtain a desired window among a plurality of overlapped windows.

**As to claims 4 and 16**, while Hiura et al. teach detecting a change comprising detecting a mouse click event (column 2, lines 1-11); Job et al. teach the user selection comprising the user clicking on the second window (column 1, line 60 through column 2, line 12). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Jobs with

Art Unit: 2179

Hiura's system. Motivation of the combination would have been to obtain a desired window among a plurality of overlapped windows.

**As to claims 6-7 and 17**, Jobs et al. also show when the first application being active and the second application is closed, the opening of the second to make the second application active or when the first application is active and the second application is open, the quitting of the first application to make the second application active (column 4, lines 22-58).

**As to claims 9 and 18**, Hiura et al. show providing visual notification being configured to render rotation animation graphics (column 3, lines 30-67).

**As to claims 10 and 19**, Hiura et al. show providing visual notification being configured to render scrolling animation graphics (column 4, lines 38-50).

**As to claims 11-13 and 20-22**, it would have been inherent that Hiura et al. show animation graphics comprising three-dimensional animation graphics, the three-dimensional animation graphics comprising animation graphics utilizing gray scales and the three-dimensional animation graphics utilize gray scale to virtual lighting effect because Hiura teaches the animated transition between two windows in a three dimensional structure (column 1, lines 60-67).

**As to claims 24-25 and 27**, Jobs et al. teach the first GUI element comprising a first menu bar having a plurality of options pertaining to functions associated with the first application and the second GUI element comprising a second menu bar having a plurality of options pertaining to functions associated with the second application, and wherein the step of replacing comprising retrieving

Art Unit: 2179

the options for the second menu bar and displaying the retrieved options at appropriate locations for the second menu bar (figures 6-7).

**As to claims 28, 31 and 34**, Hiura et al. teach detecting a change between active applications running on a computer from a first application to a second application, the first application being displayed in a first window on the computer's operating system GUI (figure 11, window 211) and the second application being displayed in a second window on the computer's operating system GUI (figure 11, window 212); and in response to detecting the change between active applications, providing visual notification of the change between active applications by rendering animation graphics to animate a transition between the display of the first and second menu bars (column 3, lines 36-44 and column 4, lines 37-50).

Hiura et al. fail to clearly teach the step of replacing a menu bar being displayed in a menu bar space on the computer's operating system GUI from a first menu bar associated with the first application to a second menu bar associated with the second application; However, Jobs et al. teach the feature at figures 6-7. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the teaching of Jobs with Hiura's system. Motivation of the combination would have been to distinguish two menu options.

**As to claims 29, 32 and 35**, Jobs et al. teach the first menu bar includes a plurality of options pertaining to functions associated with the first application and the second menu bar includes a plurality of options pertaining to functions associated with the second application, and wherein the step of replacing

Art Unit: 2179

comprising retrieving the options for the second menu bar and displaying the retrieved options at appropriate locations for the second menu bar in the menu bar space (figures 6-7).

**As to claims 30, 33 and 36,** Jobs et al. teach the menu bar space being separate from each of the first and second windows (figures 6-7).

### **Response to Arguments**

Applicant has argued that Hiura does not teach or suggest the first GUI element associated with the first application and the second GUI element associated with the second application. However, applicant's attention is directed to figure 11, the first GUI element is an object being contained in the first application window 211, the second GUI element is an object being contained in the second application window 212.

Applicant has also argued that Hiura does not teach or suggest the step of removing from the computer display the first GUI element associated with the first application and replacing the first GUI element with the corresponding second GUI element associated with the second application. However, Hiura teach the step of removing the first window and replacing by the second window in figure 11. As disclosed in figure 11, Hiura et al. teach detecting when the first application is active, user selection the object on the first window to initiate an operation of turning over to which the first window is to be turned over so as to unveil a second window that is laid under the first window, whereby enabling to peed a content of the second window (column 2, lines 1-15); removing from the



computer display the first GUI element associated with the first application and replacing the first GUI element with the corresponding second GUI element associated with the second application (column 2, lines 30-37); This is exactly the same removing and replacing steps as disclosed by the invention drawings of figure 2a-2b. Although the application 32 is removed from the computer display and replaced by the application 34, the application 32 remains on the computer display. The application 32 just becomes inactive but still displayed on the computer screen. Therefore, Hiura teaches the steps of removing and replacing of the applicant's invention.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4141.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo, can be reached at 571-272-4847.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179